

MICHAEL N. FEUER, City Attorney
THOMAS H. PETERS, Chief Assistant City Attorney
ERIC BROWN, Dep. City Attorney (State Bar No. 170410)
Email: Eric.Brown@lacity.org
200 North Main Street, 6th Floor
Los Angeles, California 90012
Telephone: 213.978.7508
Facsimile: 213.978.7011

**Attorneys for Defendant City of Los Angeles,
Lt. Andrew Mathis, Sgt. Hamer and Sgt. Richter**

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CARL MITCHELL, MICHEAL
ESCOBEDO, SALVADOR ROQUE,
JUDY COLEMAN, as individuals; LOS
ANGELES CATHOLIC WORKER,
CANGRESS, as organizations,

PLAINTIFFS,

v.

CITY OF LOS ANGELES, a municipal
entity; LT. ANDREW MATHIS, SGT.
HAMER and SGT. RICHTER, in their
individual and official capacities,

DEFENDANTS.

CASE NO. CV16-01750 SJO (JPRx)
[Assigned to the Honorable S. James
Otero, Courtroom 1]

**SEVENTH STIPULATION TO
CONTINUE HEARING DATE OF
THE CITY OF LOS ANGELES'
MOTION FOR CLARIFICATION OF
ORDER**

[Submitted with proposed order]

Date: December 19, 2016

Time: 10 a.m.

Place: Courtroom 10C

STIPULATION TO EXTEND TIME

It is hereby stipulated between Plaintiffs and the City of Los Angeles, Lt. Andrew Mathis, Sgt. Hamer and Sgt. Richter (collectively “the City”) as follows:

1. The City has filed a Motion for Clarification of the Court’s order of April 13, 2016 issuing a preliminary injunction. The motion was originally set for July 25, 2016.

2. Over the past several months, the City and Plaintiffs engaged in several mediation sessions on the City’s concerns underlying the motion on May 9, 2016, before the Honorable Carla Woehrle. Progress was made in those sessions, and the parties agreed to continue the process.

3. Each of the parties has engaged in additional separate discussions with former Magistrate Judge Woehrle and have provided written responses to the issues under discussion. The discussions with Judge Woehrle are continuing.

4. Under the present schedule, Plaintiffs’ opposition to the motion is currently due November 28, 2016.

5. To avoid the necessity of Plaintiffs opposing the motion when the parties are still engaged in mediation, the parties request that the motion hearing date be continued.

6. In light of the schedules of the various counsel in this action and the upcoming holidays, the most convenient date to which to continue the motion would be February 13, 2017.

7. The Plaintiffs and the City hereby stipulate, subject to Court approval, to continue the hearing date of the motion for clarification to January 30, 2017, in order to give the parties an opportunity to reach consensus on the issues underlying the motion.

1 It is so stipulated.

2
3 Dated: November 22, 2016

CITY OF LOS ANGELES

4
5 By: /s/ Eric Brown
6 Eric Brown, Deputy City Attorney
7 Attorneys for Defendants

8
9 Dated: November 22, 2016

LAW OFFICE OF CAROL A. SOBEL

10 By: /s/ Carol A. Sobel
11 Carol A. Sobel
12 Attorneys for Plaintiffs
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28